



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Yet I am greatly mistaken in my notions of literary art if a young retainer of a great lord could have made in 1398 or 1399 a poem with precisely the qualities of this if he had not been a reader of Chaucer.

It is not that he used Chaucerian phrases; it is not that he refashioned the substance of his story and took Chaucer as his master of narrative art; it is simply a case where diction, turn of speech, and rhythmical movement constantly recall the manner of the great poet. Of the four poems on St. Christina, which I have mentioned, that by Paris is far and away the most interesting. It is the only one that has literary quality. Bokenam in his version does not lack interest, to be sure, for his personality makes all his legends individual; but Bokenam was a disciple of Chaucer in profession rather than in fact. Lydgate, and almost certainly Gower, led astray such writers as the Austin friar into paths of which Chaucer's literary taste would have disapproved. In Paris there is no parade of learning—probably the squire had little; and no polysyllabic rimes sprawl their slow lengths upon his verse. He wrote vigorously and not ungracefully, even if not with great mastery. The trick of such verse-making must, I believe, have come from Chaucer, who was a magnificent artificer as well as a great story-teller, a wonderful humorist, and an admirable observer of life.

Paris was, it must be admitted, not very fortunate in his choice of a subject. The legend of St. Christina has not in it the possibilities that Chaucer turned to such good account in narrating the life of St. Caecilia. Yet he made of the crude tale as satisfactory a poem as might have been expected if it had been done by a versifier of much greater experience and of much more renown. To Chaucer, as well as to Paris, be the glory, since he must have been "the only begetter" of this rather charming waif from the end of the fourteenth century.

If my belief be correct as to the inspiration of the legend, the evidence that it affords of Chaucer's influence upon the court circle of his time is not without interest. If Paris indeed took him as his model, it is clear that the troubled days of King Richard were not with-

out their mitigations. It is pleasant to reflect that letters could be a solace to the retainer of an exiled lord and that, at court or in banishment, the spirit of the yet-living Chaucer could dominate his mind.

GORDON HALL GEROULD.

Princeton University.

OLD NORSE NOTES¹

IV. ETYMOLOGY OF *þengill*

Of the many Old Icelandic poetic synonyms (*ókend heiti*) for 'king,' 'prince,' 'hero,' 'man,' some few have remained obscure in origin and etymology. Among these the word *þengill* is one of the most common. Noreen² brings the word into connection with *þing*, "popular assembly." The Old Norwegian form *þingill* which he cites appears, however, to be a secondary development of the older *þengill*³ and the relation between *þengill* and *þing*, if there be one, entirely remote. Konráð Gíslason⁴ was obviously nearer the truth in rejecting the connection of the former word with *þing* and insisting upon that with *þang* (= "sea-weed": Swedish *tång*, Danish *Tang*; German *Tang* is a loan-word from the Scandinavian). The difficulty is in this case a semiological one. Gíslason called attention to *þongull*, which is an exactly parallel formation to *þengill* with suffix-gradation (*-ula*, *-ila*-, the *ø* and *e* representing respectively *u*- and *i*-umlaut of *a*), and which, according to Gíslason, applied to a particularly large and hard species of sea-weed. Gíslason thought the word *þengill* might then have been used of a man, characterizing him as surpassing other men in the same proportion as the *þongull* surpassed other kinds of sea-weed (*þang*). That this explanation is unlikely is at once apparent.

¹ Cf. *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXVI (1911), pp. 46-50.

² *Altisl. und altnorw. Gramm.*² (1903), § 161.

³ Cf. O. Rygh, *Gamle Personnavne i norske Stedsnavne* (1901), pp. 246 f.

⁴ *Forelæsninger over oldnordiske Skjaldekvad*, pp. 199 f., published 1895.

An interesting article by Much⁵ so far confirmed results which I had tentatively reached that I now venture to publish them. The Germanic tendency to compare a man with a tree or stout piece of wood had been well known through Old Norse *kenningar* and etymological matter (Much refers to previous collections). Among additions to earlier lists Much (p. 43) calls attention to the *Stingel* (Modern German *Stengel*) of Schmeller's *Bayerisches Wörterbuch*, where with others the following meaning is given: "Mannsperson, insonderheit noch lediger Bursche." Old Norse *þengill* appears to be the same word as German *Stengel* without initial *s*.⁶ The semasiological difficulties standing in the way of this assumption are not serious. That the robust sea-weeds of Northern latitudes should be designated by a word meaning "Stengel" or something similar is not remarkable. In fact, Fritzner⁷ without reference to etymology defined *þöngull* as "Tangstengel, Tangstamme" and as an Old Norse kenning *hlíðþang* or *hlíðar þang* (*hlíð*, f.="mountain-side") meant "forest."⁸ That *þang* should be related to Old Norse *stang*, German *Stange*, etc., is in the light of these facts not so incredible either.⁹

Anglo-Saxon poetry made similar use of the word *þengel* together with an alternative form *þengel*.¹⁰ A third form *strengel* ascribed to *Beowulf* (l. 3115) might almost suggest an error for *stengel*, were it not for the fact that the duplication of the *wigena strengel* (l. 3115) by *wigena strengest* (l. 1543) rather indicates that the mistake is of a different sort.¹¹

⁵ "Holz und Mensch," in *Wörter und Sachen*, I (1909), 39 ff.

⁶ Cf. Noreen, *Abriß der urgerm. Lautlehre*, pp. 201 ff. and the literature there cited for initial *s* before consonants.

⁷ *Ordbog*, III, 1067.

⁸ Sv. Egilsson, *Lexicon poeticum*, p. 357.

⁹ Torp and Falk (Fick, *Vergl. Wörterb.*, III, 1909, 179) seem in doubt as to where to put it.

¹⁰ For the relation of the *f* to the *þ* cf. Noreen, *Urgerm. Lautlehre*, p. 197.

¹¹ Cosijn's emendation (*Aanteekeningen op den Beowulf*, 1892, p. 24) *strengel* for *strengest* in the latter case, though incorporated by Holthausen in his text, is not fully convincing.

þengill has survived in Modern Norwegian as a personal name *Tengel*,¹² just as *Stengel* occurs as a family-name in German.

V. ETYMOLOGY OF *glíma*

The distinctive word for the wrestling-bout of Iceland which has persisted from the saga-period to the present time has, so far as I know, never been explained.¹³ The word exists as a noun *glíma* (fem. *-ön*-stem) and verb *glíma* (weak conjugation). It has not been recognized as a loan-word and I know of no reason to suspect that such is the case. That it might be related in some way to Old Icelandic *glý* (neut., Anglo-Saxon *gléo*, Engl. *glee*) and that from a general meaning of "amusement" it came to apply to the particular amusement of the wrestling-match does not seem likely. I am more inclined to believe that it contains the Germanic prefix *ga-*, which had in Old Icelandic in every case been reduced to *g-*.¹⁴ It is not, however, my purpose to suggest the verb *líma* meaning "to stick, glue" (German *leimen*), but rather the Germanic root *hli* (Indo-European *kli*)¹⁵ meaning "bending, inclined, leaning," occurring in a variety of words, most commonly followed by the (Indo-European) consonants *n* or *t*, though also in some words by others. With an *m*-element it is not otherwise represented in Germanic, however, except in the Gothic *hleiduma* (= "left"), where the *m* forms a part of the old superlative suffix. If it were possible for this form to become the basis of a verb or noun in Old Icelandic, the *-du-* might undoubtedly have disappeared,¹⁶ but it is not likely that such is the case. It rather seems to me that the word

¹² Cf. Aasen, *Norsk Navnebog*, p. 39.

¹³ On the Icelandic *glíma* cf. especially Björn Bjarnason, *Nordboernes legemlige Uddannelse i Oldtiden* (København, 1905), pp. 102 ff. A remarkably detailed account is given by Ólafur Davíðsson in *Íslenzkar gátur, þulur og skemtanir*, II (1888), 38-70.

¹⁴ Cf. Noreen, *Altisl. und altnorw. Gramm.*,² § 146 and the literature there cited.

¹⁵ Torp and Falk in Fick, *Vergl. Wörterb.*, III (1909), 111 ff.

¹⁶ Cf. Noreen, *Altisl. und altnorw. Gramm.*,² §§ 145b, 282.

has the *m*-element attached directly to the root. Though the Germanic languages preserve from this root no other such form with *m*, such a formation is not impossible as is shown for example by the Greek *κλίμα* and *κλίμαξ* derived from the same root.¹⁷ To be sure, the complete suffixal elements of the Greek words do not agree with that of the Germanic (Norse) one, *-mōn-*,¹⁸ but this latter is an entirely familiar Indo-European suffixal form and is represented in other feminine *n*-stems in Old Norse.¹⁹ This assumes, of course, that the verb *glíma* is secondary to the noun. The full Germanic stem-form of the noun would be, according to this theory, *gahlīmōn-*. Semasiologically this etymology is hardly objectionable. That the Icelandic should preserve this word-form lost in the other Scandinavian languages is not incredible; that it was a new formation subsequent to the settlement of Iceland is practically out of the question.

VI. *Gripisspá* 3

This Eddic poem has by pretty general consent been relegated to a place among the last in time of composition and least in point of merit of the Eddic repertory. Both in his choice of form and in his use of material the author was in many respects unfortunate, to say the least.²⁰ The poem is not however to be understood as a mere catalog-poem, a versified table of contents of the Sigurð-legend, inasmuch as the author has both chosen and treated his materials with reference to a definite object, that of making his hero appear a chivalrous knight *sans reproche*. The emphasis is thrown upon the ethical and the means employed of representing Sigurð himself as shocked at his future deception of

Brynhildr, while his prophetic uncle tries to reassure him, is at least interesting.²¹ The poem seems generally well preserved, which accords with the wide-spread conviction of its late origin: only one point at the beginning offers real difficulties.²² The first five stanzas as preserved in the *Codex regius* narrate that Sigurðr meeting Geitir outside Grípi's dwelling (1) asked the name of the inmate and was informed that it was Grípir, (2) that he expressed his desire as a stranger (*maðr ókunnigr*) to speak directly with Grípir; whereupon (3) Geitir asked his name and was informed that he was Sigurðr the son of Sigmundr and Hjördís. Geitir (4) then went and informed Grípir that a stranger (*maðr ókuþr*) had come to speak with him. Grípir (5) comes out and greets Sigurðr by name and bids him welcome. These peculiar inconsistencies with reference to Sigurð's identity evidently account for the insertion in the prose before stanza 1 of the statement that Sigurðr was easily recognizable.²³ Detter and Heinzel (p. 388) suggest that stanza 3 be regarded as an interpolation and Gering also brackets the stanza. Bugge had offered a different suggestion,²⁴ that a stanza is perhaps lost between 4 and 5, in which Geitir reported Sigurð's name. This does not, however, do away entirely with the inconsistency and has met with no acceptance. Neither does the procedure of Detter and Heinzel leave things in an entirely satisfactory condition and there is nothing in stanza 3 itself to suggest that it does not belong to the poem. It seems to me much more probable that stanza 3 was recorded in the

²¹ For an appreciation of this aspect of the poem see Heusler's introduction to Genzmer's translation: Genzmer, *Edda; erster Band, Heldendichtung* (=Niedner, Thule, 1) (1912), p. 134.

²² For suggestions for other parts, particularly by Edzardi, see the footnotes of Gering's edition: *Die Lieder der älteren Edda*, 3. Aufl. (1912), pp. 276 ff.

²³ *Sigurðr var auþkendr*; cf. Detter und Heinzel, *Sæmundar Edda*, II (1903), 387; though the reasoning of these commentators that the prose is thereby proved to have belonged originally to the poem before its inclusion in the Eddic collection is hardly to be subscribed to.

²⁴ *Norræn Fornkvæði* (1867), p. 205.

¹⁷ Cf. Boisacq, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (1911), pp. 470 f.

¹⁸ Cf. however on this point Brugmann, *Kurze vergl. Grammatik der indogerm. Sprachen* (1903), § 425.

¹⁹ Cf. Torp, *Gamalnorsk ordavleiðing*, § 19, in Hægstad og Torp, *Gamalnorsk ordbok* (1909).

²⁰ Cf. especially Mogk, Paul's *Grundriss*, II (1902), 626 ff.

wrong place and that it should stand after 4. The sequence of events would then be: Sigurþr asked Geitir the name of the occupant of the house and was informed that it was Grípir; he asked as stranger for an audience; Geitir obediently reported that a stranger wished admittance; he was sent back to ascertain the stranger's name and was informed that it was Sigurþr Sigmundarson; having learned his identity Grípir comes out, greets him as Sigurþr and bids him welcome. With this change the assumption of a lost stanza or two seems to me unnecessary, as the context becomes sufficiently clear without it. If understood in this way stanza 5, verse 3: *Þigg hér, Sigurþr! væri sœmra fyrr*; ("Be welcome, Sigurþr! it would have been more fitting before") is better understood as a natural apology for not having admitted him immediately, not as it is generally interpreted as a reproach for not having come before.²⁵

A. LE ROY ANDREWS.

Cornell University.

DAPHNÉ: ALFRED DE VIGNY HISTORIEN

M. Fernand Gregh vient de publier *Daphné*, cette œuvre à laquelle Vigny a fait allusion dans le *Journal d'un Poète* et dont le titre mystérieux avait intrigué les critiques.¹

Daphné est la suite directe de *Stello*, paru en 1832 et qui portait en exergue: "Les Consultations du Docteur Noir, Première Consultation." Les deux interlocuteurs de *Stello* sont les mêmes que dans *Daphné*: Stello et le Doc-

teur Noir; le premier personnifie l'enthousiasme, le second l'esprit critique du poète. C'est un épisode, le seul qui soit achevé, d'un grand roman cyclique qui devait mettre en scène le réformateur religieux à travers les âges. Écrivant en 1837, Vigny était encore sous le coup de l'impression produite par les *Paroles d'un Croyant* que Lamennais venait de publier et qui avaient obtenu un succès prodigieux.

Le roman, dont l'action se passait à l'époque contemporaine, devait renfermer trois épisodes historiques introduits d'une façon quelconque dans sa trame. Ainsi *Daphné* est un manuscrit de lettres écrites par un jeune Juif, élève de Libanius, que lisent ensemble Stello et le Docteur Noir. Des autres épisodes et du roman proprement dit, il ne reste que des fragments souvent très intéressants. Témoin cette description de la foule parisienne un soir de fête si réaliste et en même temps si poétique et que M. Savj-Lopez admire à si juste titre.² Nous savons aussi que les deux autres épisodes devaient rouler sur Mélanchthon et J. J. Rousseau, comme *Daphné* met en scène Julien l'Apostat. Ces trois réformateurs devaient échouer parce qu'ils avaient trop de tendresse pour l'humanité, qu'il leur manquait cette dureté implacable de Luther et de Voltaire.

Ces lettres du jeune Juif, qui forment la deuxième partie et la plus importante de *Daphné*, nous présentent un merveilleux tableau de l'état moral de l'empire romain au IV^e siècle et un Julien l'Apostat des plus attachants et des plus profonds qui soient. Au milieu de l'envahissement de l'empire par le christianisme, il reste un îlot à peine atteint par le flot montant de la nouvelle doctrine: c'est *Daphné*, le faubourg d'Antioche, au temple et au bois sacré si fameux, demeure de Libanius qui personnifie ici la suprême sagesse. De ce sommet Libanius embrasse le présent et l'avenir: l'inutilité de la tentative de Julien—on ne chasse pas une religion avec de la philosophie—; la ruine du christianisme grec trop subtil, trop argumentateur, bon à produire des sectes qui

²⁵ The Grimm brothers, *Lieder der alten Edda* (1815), p. 130, referred to the possibility of an alternative interpretation of the latter half of this verse.

¹ *Daphné* (Deuxième Consultation du Docteur Noir). Œuvre posthume publiée d'après le manuscrit original. Avec une préface et des notes par Fernand Gregh. Edition définitive. Paris, Ch. Delagrave, 1913. *Daphné* a été publié pour la première fois mais d'une façon moins complète, par M. Gregh dans la *Revue de Paris* (15 juin, 1^{er} juillet et 15 juillet 1912).

² "*Dafne*. Un'opera postuma di Alfred de Vigny," par Paolo Savj-Lopez, *Nuova Antologia*, 16 novembre, 1913.